DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 223 SP 034 300

AUTHOR Zeichner, Kenneth M.
TITLE Beyond Inquiry-Oriented Teacher Education: Rethinking the Practicum. Monograph No. 17.
INSTITUTION Saskatchewan Univ., Saskatoon. Coll. of Education.
PUB DATE Sep 92
NOTE 37p.; Revised version of the keynote address presented at the Western Canadian Association for Student Teaching (Edmonton, Alberta, Canada, 1992).
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Strategies; *Curriculum Problems; Educational Practices; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; Inquiry; *Learning Strategies; *Practicums; Preservice Teacher Education; *Student Teaching; Teaching Experience
IDENTIFIERS Canada; *Professional Development Schools; Reflective Teaching; Reform Efforts

ABSTRACT

This paper highlights some emerging trends in rethinking the teacher education practicum in North America. The paper discusses several major obstacles to student teacher learning that persist even in many of the new inquiry-oriented practicums that focus on the development of reflective teaching practice. While teachers praise the value of the practicum in relation to the rest of the teacher education program, there has been criticism of the ways in which the practicum as it is typically conducted undermines student teacher learning. It is argued that the practicum experience in its present form needs restructuring, and that major changes are needed to fundamentally alter power and role relationships. A practicum experience that is a more educative experience should prepare prospective teachers to enter learning communities; to assume the full range of teachers' responsibilities; and to learn to teach everybody's children, not just children like themselves. The recent re-emergence of the professional development school movement in North America is described as an example of the beginning of a paradigm shift in clinical teacher education. (Contains 78 references.) (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354223

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN **OTHER THAN PAPER COPY** HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Barnett

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SP034300

Beyond Inquiry-Oriented Teacher Education:

Rethinking the Practicum

Abstract

This paper, a revised version of the keynote address at the Western Canadian Association for Student Teaching in Edmonton discusses several major obstacles to student teacher learning that persist even in many of the new inquiry-oriented practicums in North America that focus on the development of reflective teaching practice. It is argued that we have done as far as we can go improving the practicum under its present structure, and that major changes are needed that fundamentally alter power and role relationships in the practicum. The recent re-emergence of the professional development school movement in North America is described as an example of the beginning of a paradigm shift in clinical teacher education.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Kenneth M. Zeichner is coordinator of the elementary student teaching program at the University of Wisconsin - Madison. He is the author of numerous texts and articles on teacher education, and has written extensively on the practicum in teacher education.

Beyond Inquiry-Oriented Teacher Education

This paper is focused on what I perceive to be some of the emerging trends in rethinking the teacher education practicum in North America. I think that we are at a critical juncture right now in North American teacher education. The role of colleges and universities in preservice teacher education is being seriously challenged by many, and unless those of us in colleges and universities are willing to take some very bold steps in restructuring the power relations between schools and universities in teacher education, examples of which I will discuss in this paper, we will see the same kind of developments here that have recently occurred in the U.K. where the role of tertiary institutions in preservice teacher education has been significantly marginalized (Barton, Pollard, & Whitty, in press). The changes that we must undertake will not be easy, and even if we began yesterday, as has been the case in several places, it will be many years, and into the 21st century, before we begin to reap the benefits of these changes.

I use the term practicum in a generic sense to include all varieties of observation, and teaching experiences in a preservice teacher education program: field experiences that precede professional education course work, early field experiences that are tied to particular professional courses and, student teaching and internship experiences. The first question that might come to mind is why the need to rethink something that teachers almost always identify as the highlight of their teacher education program? Why fix something that isn't broken? The fact is, that while teachers in North America have typically praised the value of the practicum to their education for teaching, in relation to the rest of their teacher education program, there has been a lot of well documented criticism in the last decade of the ways in which the practicum, as it is typically conducted, undermines student teacher learning (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann,

1985b; Guyton & McIntyre, 1990; Zeichner, 1990a). I will now discuss a few of these obstacles to student teacher learning that are often associated with the practicum as it is usually conducted, and some of the efforts of school and university teacher educators in recent years to try to deal with these obstacles with the goal of making the practicum a more educative experience for students, an experience that: (1) contributes to the further learning of prospective teachers, (2) prepares them to enter learning communities rather than isolated classrooms, (3) better prepares them the for the full range of the teacher's responsibilities, and (4) better prepares student teachers to teach everybody's children and not just children like themselves.

First, I will summarize some of the major obstacles to student teacher learning that have been identified in the typical practicum. Those who are well versed in the teacher education literature will be familiar with many of these. I want to argue however, that these obstacles to teacher learning exist in many practicums, despite the recent shift in North America to the so called inquiry-oriented or research-based practicum where the emphasis is on helping student teachers develop dispositions capabilities to "reflect" about their teaching (Goodman, 1986; Zeichner & Liston, 1987). Almost everyone is in agreement now that more time spent by student teachers in schools is not necessarily better, and that the quality of the experience needs careful planning and close monitoring. There aren't too many people around today who would argue that the old model of putting student teachers in schools and hoping that good things will happen (learning to teach by osmosis) is a viable alternative. Despite all of these changes, and despite the now common inquiry-oriented practices of student teachers telling their stories, writing journals, doing action research, producing case studies, supervising each other, and so on, we still have a long way to go in my view

before the practicum begins to approach its potential for helping us to realize the purposes of education in a democratic society.

The old model of the practicum where good teaching was supposed to be caught and not taught and where good things happened more by accidental misfortune than be deliberate design, was based on a view of teaching as an applied science where the student teacher's job was believed to be to apply during the practicum that which was previously learned in campus courses (Stones, 1984). There was very little new learning of a theoretical kind and very little learning of any kind, beyond mastering the routines of the cooperating teacher's classroom, that was expected to occur during the practicum. Learning to teach and how to improve one's teaching was seen as learning how to make one's classroom practice more closely match either the particular practices advocated in college courses or that which was exhibited by specific cooperating teachers. Student teachers frequently experienced a conflict between the two. The process of learning to teach was viewed as something that was substantially completed upon graduation from a teacher education program.

The movement in recent years to the inquiry-oriented or research-based practicum has involved a number of assumptions far different from those that governed the practicum of the past. In the new enlightened version of the practicum there is a recognition that the process of understanding and improving one's teaching must start from reflection upon one's own experience and that the sort of wisdom derived entirely from the experience of others, even other teachers, is at best impoverished and at worst illusory (Winter, 1989). It involves a recognition that learning to teach is a process that continues throughout a teacher's career and that no matter what we do in our teacher education programs, and no matter how well we do them, at best, we can only prepare

teachers to begin teaching. There is also a commitment by teacher educators to helping prospective teachers internalize during their initial training, the dispositions and skills to study their teaching and to become better at teaching over time - a commitment to help teachers take responsibility for their own professional development. Why aren't all of these new developments in the new inquiry-oriented practicum enough? What are the obstacles to teacher learning that persist in this new enlightened version of the practicum?

Obstacles to Teacher Learning

There are several serious impediments to genuine teacher learning in the new inquiry-oriented practicum. I'm going to discuss a few of them here. The first set of obstacles has to do with the meaning of the term "reflection" in many inquiry-oriented practicums. Despite recent efforts to help student teachers become more "reflective" about their teaching during the practicum, the ways in which the terms reflection, reflective teaching, and the reflective practitioner have come to be used in many North American teacher education programs have done very little to foster genuine teacher development. Instead an illusion of teacher development is often created that maintains in more subtle ways the subservient position of the teacher in the schooling process.[1] There are four characteristics of the way in which the concept of reflection has been employed in teacher education practicums that undermine the expressed educative intent of teacher educators.[2]

First, one of the most common uses of this concept involves helping student teachers to reflect about their teaching with the primary aim of better replicating in their practice that which university sponsored empirical research has allegedly found to be effective. Sometimes the creative intelligence of the student teacher is allowed to

intervene to determine the situational approach of employing particular strategies, but often times not. Grimmett et al., (1990) refer to this perspective as one where reflection serves merely as an instructional mediator of action. It clearly falls within the social efficiency tradition of reform in teacher education (Liston & Zeichner, 1991) where the source of knowledge for reflection is external to the practice being studied. What is absent from this very prevalent conception of reflective teaching practice is any sense of how the practical theories that reside in the practices of teachers, knowledge in action if you will, are to contribute to the education of the student teacher.

Ironically, despite Schon's very articulate rejection of this technical rationality in several very influential books (Schon, 1983; 1987; 1991), theory is still seen by many to reside exclusively within universities and practice to reside only within elementary and secondary schools. The problem is still wrongly cast by many as merely one of translating or applying the theories which are always produced through practice, and that practices always reflect or generate particular theoretical commitments. The relationship between theory and practice is seen as one-way instead of dialogic. In a dialogic relationship, theory and practice inform each other (Britzman, 1991).

There are many examples of the misguided view of reflective practice in contemporary teacher education programs such as when student teachers are assessed by college supervisors and cooperating teachers solely according to how well they "reflectively" apply specific aspects of what is referred to as the "knowledge base of teaching" in their daily practice.[3] The use of the Madeline Hunter model (Gentile, 1988) and the Florida Performance Measurement System to structure student teacher supervision and assessment are specific and current instances of this in the U.S. My

point is not that we should completely reject university sponsored research by teaching, (this would be foolish in my view) but that we need more of a balance between received knowledge about teaching and student teacher directed inquiry about their own teaching (Taylor & Runte, 1991).

Closely related to this persistence of technical rationality under the banner of reflective teaching, is the limitation of the reflective process to consideration of teaching skills and strategies (the means of instruction) and the exclusion from the process of the ends and actual substance of teaching. Here teaching becomes a merely a technical activity and important questions of value such as what should be taught to whom and why (and whose perspectives and what values are represented in what is taught) are considered outside of the arena of student teacher deliberations. One of the clearest examples of this instrumental conception of reflective practice in North American teacher education is the Reflective Teaching program developed at Ohio State University and marketed throughout the world by the U.S. Association of Teacher Educators and Phi Delta Kappa (Cruickshank, 1987). Here and with other similar "snake oil" versions of reflective teaching (Massey & Chamberlin, 1990), student teachers are encouraged to reflect for the sake of reflecting, and because the structured lessons they are supposed to be reflecting about are claimed to be "content free," not surprisingly what results from this structure is a lot of thinking and discussing about teaching techniques and strategies divorced from ethical questions related to what is taught to whom and why.

A third way in which recent uses of the notion of reflective practice in teacher education promotes bogus rather than genuine teacher development is an emphasis in many programs on focusing teachers' reflections inwardly at their own teaching and/or on their students, to the neglect of any consideration of the social conditions of schooling

that influence the teacher's work within the classroom. This individualist bias makes it less likely that teachers will be able to confront and transform those structural aspects of their work that hinder their educational mission. We must be careful here that teachers' involvement in matters beyond the boundaries of their own classrooms does not make excessive demands on their time, energy, and expertise, diverting their attention from their core educational mission with students, but with proper precautions against the intensification of the teacher's work beyond the bound of reasonableness, we must find ways to prepare student teachers to enter teaching ready and able to participate in the shaping of the context within which they will work. As the philosopher Israel Scheffler has argued:

> Teachers cannot restrict their attention to the classroom alone, leaving the larger setting and the purposes of schooling to be determined by others. They must take active responsibility for the goals to which they are committed and for the social setting in which these goals may prosper. If the military, of the media, of the experts and bureaucrats, they need to determine their own agency through a critical and continual evaluation of the purposes, the consequences, and the social context of their calling. (p.11)

A fourth way in which current practices in the current reflective teaching movement in preservice teacher education has hindered student teacher learning is the common focus on facilitating reflection by individual teachers who are to think by themselves about their work. There is a very little sense in a lot of the discourse on reflective teaching, or reflection as a social practice where groups of teachers can support and sustain each other's growth. The definition of teacher learning and development as an activity to be pursued only by individual teachers greatly limits the potential for

teacher growth. The intellectual challenge and social support gained through social interaction is important to helping us clarify what we believe and in gaining the courage to pursue our beliefs.

One consequence of this isolation of individual teachers and of the lack of attention to the social context of teaching in teacher development is that teachers come to see their problems as their own unrelated to those of other teachers or to the structure of schools and school systems (Freedman, Jackson, & Boles, 1983). Thus we have the emergence of the terms "teacher burnout" and "teacher stress" which direct the attention of teachers away from a critical analysis of schools as institutions to a preoccupation with their own individualist approach and toward the induction of student teachers into a community of teachers that plays a major role in the shaping of school environments.

In summary, when we examine the ways in which the concepts of reflection and the reflective practitioner have been recently integrated into preservice teacher education programs, including the practicum, we find four themes that undermine genuine teacher learning: (1) a focus on helping student teachers better replicate through reflection practices suggested by research conducted by others and a neglect of the theories and expertise embedded in their own and other teachers' practices, (2) a means-end thinking which limits the substance of student teachers' reflections to technical questions of teaching techniques and internal classroom organization and neglects questions of curriculum, (3) the facilitation of student teachers' reflection about their own teaching while ignoring the social and institutional context in which the teaching takes place, and (4) an emphasis on helping teachers to reflect individually. All of these common practices help create a situation where there is merely the illusion of teacher learning. I would also add that the often vague exhortations directed at prospective teachers by self-

proclaimed critical social theorists who themselves have no direct involvement with elementary, secondary or teacher education classrooms is equally as problematic in fostering student teacher learning (Ellsworth, 1989; Gore, 1990).[4]

In addition to these problematic uses of the concept of reflective practice in the new inquiry-oriented practicum, there are several other major impediments to teacher learning in even many of the most thoughtfully conceived of the current generation of practicums. For example, for the most part, even in inquiry-oriented practicums, individual student teachers continue to be placed with individual cooperating teachers for their practicum work and their attention is limited almost exclusively to the domain of the classroom. It has been argues that because student teachers tend to work with only one teacher at a time, in an isolated classroom, they learn that teaching is a solitary activity (Bradley, 1991). Typically, the practicum proceeds inside classrooms as if the rest of the school does not exist. Goodlad (1990) concluded in his recent study of preservice teacher education in the U.S. that:

> It was rare to find students whose student teaching exposed them to aspects of school life beyond the classroom to which they were assigned... it would be extraordinary, verging on the bizarre, for novices to come into their first teaching assignments attuned to school problems and all steamed up to do something about them. (p. 254)

Goodlad (1990) argues that student teachers typically learn a good deal about how to go it alone within a classroom, and like many others who have examined the scope of the typical practicum (e.g., Turney, 1985), he concludes that the practice of placing students in a single classroom with a single teacher is seriously flawed because it fails to prepare teachers for the full range of responsibilities they have to assume even as

beginning teachers, including their roles as stewards of schools. In many places throughout North America, teachers are now assuming new responsibilities for school-based curriculum development, staff development, school governance, and for new forms of relations with colleagues, parents, and the community (Liberman, 1988). A focus during the practicum only on instruction with children within the classroom does not prepare teachers for the full range of their responsibilities and for the leadership roles that they will be expected to play in many places.

Although there have been some programs in recent years which have attempted to break down some programs in recent years which have attempted to break down some of this isolation and foster collegiality through paired placements or peer supervision among student teachers (Chamberlin & Vallance, 1991; Samiroden & Stewart, 1988; Miller, 1989), very few of these innovations expand the practicum beyond the domain of the classroom to include attention to the school and community. The notion of the school and its community as the site for a practicum rather than just the individual classroom, has been strongly advocated in the U.S. since the Flowers Report (Flowers et at., 1948) articulated standards for the modern era of the practicum. However, until recently, with the exception of a few programs such as the National Teacher Corps (Smith, 1980), the school and community domains of the teacher's work have been ignored in the practicum, reinforcing the role of the teacher as a technician that the formal curriculum of most teacher education programs overtly rejects, and undermining authentic school and community linkages, particularly in schools where there is a large gap between the culture of the school and the culture of the community, where it is especially important for teachers to become sensitive and responsive to values, lifestyles and cultures very different than their own (Cummins, 1986; Comer, 1988; Zeichner, 1990b).

Another limitation of focusing on the individual classroom as opposed to the school as the site for a practicum is that it often reinforces many of the negative effects of the traditional unstructured apprenticeship model that many teacher educations claim to reject. For even if the luck of the draw is good for a particular student teacher, and a cooperating teacher exhibits many of the characteristics and capabilities that are favored in the ideology of a teacher education program, the passive imitation of a single teacher that is inevitably encouraged in individual classroom placements inhibits the capacity of students to continue to learn from experience over time (Buchmann & Schwille, 1983). As Stones & Morris (1977) of the U.K have argued:

> A master teacher, however versatile, can offer a student only a limited set of skills, attitudes and personality traits... This approach does not go beyond the teaching observed. This teaching may be excellent, but it cannot be exhaustively excellent. There will certainly be areas of teaching excellence that are not illustrated by any one master teacher, and more appropriate ways of doing things than those the master teacher employs. (pp. 8-9)

The pressures brought to bear on both students and their cooperating teachers within exclusive single class placements, even when cooperating teachers give their student teachers access to the thinking and reasoning underlying their actions and the classroom routines and settings they have created, unnecessarily limits student teacher learning (Feiman-Nemser &* Buchmann, 1985b).

Another area in which student teacher learning continues to be limited is by the uneven quality of practicum supervision. Despite a number of very promising examples of interactive approaches to student teacher supervision that are consistent with the core assumptions of the inquiry-oriented practicum about the need for student teachers to

further develop their practical theories of teaching through continuous reflection in and on action, approaches that use what student teachers already know as the departure point for new learning (Handal & Lauvas, 1987; Bowers & Flindrs, 1991; Erickson & MacKinnon, 1991), there continues to be a great deal of difficulty with much of the supervision and assessment that occurs in the practicum (Richardson-Koehler, 1988).

One problem continues to be the way in which practicum placements are often selected. Here, despite the valuable contributions of a strong corps of cooperating teachers in some teacher education programs whose work is terribly unappreciated, the choice of placements in many programs continue to be based on convenience and on giving everyone an equal share, rather than on what could provide the best learning experience for student teachers (Goodlad, 1990; Zimpher, 1900).

Also, despite the dedicated work of many college and university supervisors whose labor in schools helps keep them marginalized within their own institutions (Clifford & Guthrie, 1988; Lanier & Little, 1986), we continue to read reports about how student teachers frequently reject or ignore much of the feedback that comes from these people who appear in the school only at the special times for supervision (Calderhead, 1989). The university supervisor is in a very difficult position of course, having no authority whatsoever in the practicum school in most situations. Furthermore, there appears to be a unwillingness on the part of many cooperating teachers and university supervisors to discuss controversial issues or to offer critical feedback in supervision for fear of upsetting the delicate balance of the triad (Menter, 1989; Zimpher, DeVoss, & Nott, 1980) Also, despite the existence of such practices as clinical supervision (Acheson & Gall, 1987) and an explosion of staff development materials for student teacher supervisors (e.g., ASCD, 1988), the evaluation of student teachers still seems to be based in too many cases

on the social acceptability of student teachers rather than on their teaching ability (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). And finally, as several recent case studies at Michigan State University have shown, student teachers are often denied access to the thinking and reasoning underlying their cooperating teacher's actions or to the reasons behind actions that their cooperating teachers ask them to take (Feiman-Nemser & Buchmann, 1987). One consequence of this failure of many cooperating teachers to be actively present in the practicum as teacher educators, to give their student teachers a concrete sense of their pedagogical thinking, and to help student teachers surface and examine the assumptions and beliefs they bring to the experience related to the central tasks of teaching, is that the practicum ends up in many cases reinforcing and strengthening the perspectives that students bring to the experience without providing a foundation for further learning. Feiman-Nemser and Buchmann (1985a) have argued that:

> In becoming a teacher, very little normatively correct learning can be trusted to come about without instruction that takes the preconceptions of future teachers into account-preconceptions that are warranted by common sense and the conventional practice that future teachers are already steeped in. In learning to teach, neither first-hand experience nor university instruction can be left to work themselves out by themselves. Without help in examining current beliefs and assumptions, teacher candidates are likely to maintain conventional beliefs and incorporate new information or puzzling experiences into old frameworks. (p. 29)

I want to emphasize two things with regard to the issue of practicum supervision. First, I want to state again that I am referring to a consensus among teacher educators about the overall condition of the practicum in North America. There are a number of very promising developments in student teacher supervision that exist in a relatively

small number of programs that need to be recognized. Examples of these include the work of Erickson & Mackinnon (1991) in Canada in adapting some of Schon's ideas on coaching in the reflective practicum, to practicum work in science education, Handel & Lauvas's (1987) work, originating in Europe, with the development of strategies to help student teachers critically examine and then further develop the basic assumptions and core beliefs they bring to the classroom, and Cochran-Smith's (1991) in the U.S. which involves an abandonment of the clinical supervision structure all together and the immersion of student teachers into collaborative teacher research communities. The problem is that these and other developments like them exit in relatively few programs. In many programs, what I have described in the norm and the rituals of supervision matter very little in helping to shape student teacher learning during the practicum.

The second thing that I want to emphasize is that I do not see the current problems with student teacher supervision to be primarily a result of the lack of training for supervisors and cooperating teachers. Although it has been shown that supervisory training can improve student teachers' satisfaction with the supervision they receive during the practicum (Holburn & Olliver, 1988; smith, 19900, there are severe limitations in my view of our ability to improve practicum supervision just by providing more and better training for school and university supervisors. The reason that I believe this is because more and better supervision training does nothing at all to alter the structural context in which the supervision takes place. The fact is that in most programs the practicum is not a priority issue for either the schools or universities. Cooperating teachers are rarely given any adjustment in their role to accommodate the added responsibilities of teacher education they assume. They most often take on the mentoring of prospective teachers in addition to everything else that they already do and

often with little or no compensation from the university. University supervisors also have very little institutional incentives in many places to offer high quality supervision because of the low status of this work in many colleges and universities. In many institutions, it is a fact as Goodlad (1990) points out that:

> The closer one gets to working with future teachers in the field and school classroom, the less prestige and security one has within the institution of higher education. (p. 245)

In many institutions there is a hierarchy within faculties of education where the practicums are coordinated and supervised by temporary university staff with little power over shaping the programs in which they work. While I have spent a great deal of my professional life teaching courses and workshops related to supervision and mentoring, and will continue to do so, (I believe they can if properly conducted improve the practicum experience for students up to a point), I have become convinced as have many others (e.g., Hopkins, 1985), that we as a field have gone about as far as we can in improving the practicum within the present structure. The next step of development in my view must involve the creation of new structural arrangements for the practicum which allow the expertise of cooperating teachers and university supervisors to be better utilized and to be properly recognized and rewarded.

A final impediment to teacher learning in the current inquiry-oriented practicum that I want to discuss here is that in many cases these experiences provide student teachers with very little exposure to culturally diverse learners and with very little preparation to teach in culturally diverse schools serving poor children. Student teachers frequently come into their teacher education programs with very little intercultural and interracial experience and in most cases when they leave their programs, they will want

to teach only students like themselves. (Zeichner, 1992). We have a massive reluctance on the part of teacher education students at least in the U.S. to teach in urban areas and in other schools serving the poor and ethnic and language minority pupils (Haberman, 1987). This is the case while our public schools become increasingly diverse and while the failure of public school systems in many countries to educate increasing numbers of immigrants and ethnic minorities in both rural and urban areas is becoming increasingly evident in such measures as illiteracy rates, high school suspension rates and classification patterns for special education and gifted programs (Bastien et al. 1985; Quality Education for Minorities Project, 1990). Goodlad's (1990) study of teacher education in the U.S. tells us that teacher education students all over this country have essentially written off many of the students who are not now succeeding in school:

> The idea of moral imperatives for teachers was virtually a foreign concept and strange in language for most of the future teachers we interviewed. Many were less than convinced that all student can learn; they voiced the view that they should be kind and considerate to all, but they accepted as fact the theory that some simply can't learn. (p. 264)

I am not suggesting, as some have, that the numerous injustices that can be found in our public school systems are caused by teachers and schools. Schools did not cause these problems and school reform and teacher education reform by themselves can not solve them. On the contrary, there is irrefutable evidence in many countries that social class, gender, race and other factors play strong roles in determining access to a variety of things in addition to a quality education - quality housing, health care, rewarding work that pays a decent wage, and that they affect the incidence of a whole host of "rotten outcomes' such as malnutrition, child abuse, physical and psychological stress, childhood

pregnancies, violent crime during adolescence and drug abuse (Schon, 1988). Over 13 million children in the U.S. currently live in conditions of poverty that make them highly vulnerable to many of these factors (Children's Defense Fund, 1991). I suspect that the situation is similar in Canada for many immigrants and ethnic minorities.

Anyway you look at it, this situation is outrageous. Once can agree that it is an outrageous situation though and see little connection between what one does as a teacher or teacher educator and these social and economic problems that include, but also go way beyond the arenas of education and teacher education. On the other hand, there is the view to which I personally subscribe, that neither teaching nor teacher education can be neutral. We as educators, at whatever level, must act with greater clarity about whose interests we are furthering in our daily work, because whether acknowledged or not, we are taking a stand on these societal problems in our actions and through our words, even in such settings as the practicum. While educational actions by teachers and teacher educators cannot solve the social and economic problems with which we are faced, they can contribute their share to the building of more decent and just societies.

What does all of this have to do with the practicum you might be asking? In my opinion, it has a lot to do with the practicum. On the one hand, we continually read depressing accounts of the status of ethnic and language minorities in many countries, about the growing gaps between the rich and poor in these countries. We also continue to read about the massive reluctance of prospective teachers and their teacher educators to want to face these stark realities. Zimpher (1989) recently concluded her analysis of data about teacher education students in the U.S. with the observation that there appears to be a general affinity among teacher education students to teach students who are like themselves in communities which are familiar to them. Another survey of

directors of student teaching programs in the U.S. (Mahan & Boyle, 1981) estimated that over 60% of teacher education students, the majority of whom are white and monolingual, do not desire any field experiences in multicultural settings.

I don't blame teacher education students for their reluctance to teach in settings with which they are unfamiliar and where the problems are indeed very great. I do blame us however, their teacher educators for failing to prepare them to do so, and for failing to make the development of social responsibility a priority in our teacher education programs. In many cases we have obliged culturally encapsulated student teachers by bypassing culturally diverse schools serving poor children for practicum placements, even in universities located in the center of urban areas (Goodlad, 1990). We have also neglected in the practicum curriculum many questions related to the social and political implications of teaching practice as they arise in the particular situations in which student teachers act. These issues, if they are considered at all, are usually considered at a more abstract level in campus courses that are detached from the daily world of student teachers. This approach does not help students learn to see how questions of equity and social justice are embodied in their everyday actions and settings, and that they are not just something "out there" to be debated within universities.

While most of you are undoubtedly very familiar with the existence of the kind of social and economic problems that I've alluded to in this paper, one sees almost nothing at all about these questions of equity and social justice in the literature on teacher education including that on the practicum. There is an enormous disjuncture between the bland character of the practicum literature and the truly agonizing problems of the increasing number of schools serving poor children. I've read a great deal in the last few years about how important it is to help student teachers become more reflective about

their teaching in the practicum, about all of the improvements that have taken place in preparing supervisors to enable reflective teaching, about how through methods like story telling, journal writing and action research we are doing a much better job of enabling student teachers to come to understand themselves and their own commitments and to develop habits of monitoring and improving their teaching, but I have read very little about how all of this enlightened practice is helping us to better prepare teachers to educate everybody's children in culturally diverse and democratic societies. This failure of the practicum to engage the problems of building more decent and just societies for everybody's children is a major impediment in many programs to the learning os student teachers. If teachers are not being educated to teach children of any social origin and background, as they are not now in many programs, then we teacher educators are not doing our jobs well enough. What I am talking about goes far beyond merely placing student teachers in culturally diverse schools for their practicum work, and is just as important for those white monolingual prospective teachers who end up teaching students just like themselves, because their students will not be properly educated if they are not helped to understand and develop respect many different kinds of diversities (Smith, 1969).

What is it that can be done to confront the obstacles to the genuine learning of student teachers that I have touched on in this paper, obstacles that exist even in many of the new enlightened inquiry-oriented practicums? As I've stated several times, I am of the opinion that we have gone as far as we can go within the current structure of the practicum to make things better. In recent years, in Canada and in the U.S., we have seen major increases in the time student teachers spend in practicum work (at my own university students complete 27 weeks of practicum work for initial certification),

improvements in the preparation of their supervisors, and in the articulation of a practicum curriculum, and some progress in breaking down the isolation of teaching and in fostering norms of collaboration through such means as paired placements and peer coaching. All of these developments have clearly helped improve the quality of preservice teacher education. We are still often faced however, with the lack of connection between the campus and field portions of a teacher education program, with practicums that focus on the classroom but ignore the school and community, and with practicums that exist in institutions that do not value high quality teacher education nor reward those who make it happen. Incidently, although practicums have expanded greatly in recent years, the overall budgets for these programs have decreased considerably,when inflation is taken into account (Guyton & McIntyre, 1990). This is because of the hostile institutional climates in which many practicums exist.

Professional Development Schools

In the last 5 years, there has been an acceleration of a movement in the U.S. and in some places in Canada as well (Borys, Taylor & LaRocque, in press) that has involved a major break with the current structure of the practicum. I say acceleration rather than birth because like most contemporary reforms in teacher education, it is the re-emergence in a new form of something that has been around for many years (see Stallings & Kowalski, 1990 Zeichner 1990a). In many teacher education programs across the U.S. efforts have been underway for several years, to situate the teacher education practicum in specific schools within the public system that have made a special commitment to the preparation of prospective teachers. These schools go by many different names. I'll call them professional development schools. They are also referred to as clinical schools, professional practice schools, practice schools, partnership schools and teaching

academies (Carnegie, 1986; Levine 1988; Goodlad, 1990; Stallings, Bossung, & Martin, 1990; Meade, 1991).

Professional development schools (PDS) are often schools jointly controlled by school systems and universities, frequently involving the formation of formal partnership agreements between institutions. There are many different forms of the PDS under development today, none of them fully developed at present, despite visions of the ideal PDS that have been set forth by those such as the Homes Group (1990). This movement to restructure the practicum and integrate it with inservice teacher education and school reform, involves major changes in the roles and responsibilities of those who work in the practicum and a significant shift in the distribution of power between schools and universities. University faculty, teachers and administrators are struggling with working out the new dimensions of their roles (such as classroom teachers having a greater say in the total teacher education curriculum, and with university faculty playing a greater role in supporting and helping to institutionalize school reforms). They are also beginning to develop drastically new ways of working with one another that are based on the belief that clinical teacher education needs to be a shared responsibility among equal partners (Meade, 1991). Given the history of university exploitation of schools for the purposes of research and teacher education, always taking much more than they give back (Zimpher, 1990), university and school relations in many places have been, as Goodlad (1990) has pointed out, something far short of a romance. In the newly emerging professional development schools, professors and teachers are learning to throw aside titles and egos, and anger built up over the past, and are trying to create genuine collaborations which demonstrate respect for the knowledge and expertise that <u>all</u> parties bring to the table. One teacher in Edmonds Washington in a new professional

development school when interviewed about the changes that have taken place in her interactions with university faculty replied "the exchange of ideas which formerly was viewed as the university expert pontificating to uninformed domestics has become conversations in which both sides make significant contributions." (p.9)

There are three major dimensions to a professional development school in its fully developed form. In addition to the main focus on pupil learning, there is an emphasis on teacher development (preservice and inservice) and on school, something that has been around for many years (see Stallings & Kowalski, 1990 Zeichner 1990a). In many teacher education programs across the U.S. efforts have been underway for several years, to situate the teacher education practicum in specific schools within the public system that have made a special commitment to the preparation of prospective teachers. These schools go by many different names. I'll call them professional development schools. They are also referred to as clinical schools, professional practice schools, practice schools, partnership schools and teaching academies (Carnegie, 1986; Levien 1988; Goodlad, 1990; Stallings, Bossung, & Martin, 1990; Meade, 1991).

Professional development schools (PDS) are often schools jointly controlled by school systems and universities, frequently involving the formation of formal partnership agreements between institutions. There are many different forms of the PDS under development today, none of them fully developed at present, despite visions of the ideal PDS that have been set forth by those such as the Holmes Group (1990). This movement to restructure the practicum and integrate it with inservice teacher education and school reform, involves major changes in the roles and responsibilities of those who work in the practicum and a significant shift in the distribution of power between schools and universities. University faculty, teachers and administrators are struggling with working

out the new dimensions of their roles (such as classroom teachers having a greater say in the total teacher education curriculum, and with university faculty playing a greater role in supporting and helping to institutionalize schools reforms). They are also beginning to develop drastically new ways of working with one another that are based on the belief that clinical teacher education needs to be a shared responsibility among equal partners (Meade, 1991). Given the history of university exploitation of schools for the purposes of research and teacher education, always taking much more than they give back (Zimpher, 1990), university and school relations in many places have been, as Goodlad (1990) has pointed out, something far short of a romance. In the newly emerging professional development schools, professors and teachers are learning to throw aside titles and egos, and anger built up over the past, and are trying to create genuine collaborations which demonstrate respect for the knowledge and expertise that all parties bring to the table. One teacher in Edmonds Washington in a new professional development school when interviewed about the changes that have taken place in her interactions with university faculty replied "the exchange of ideas which formerly was viewed as the university expert pontificating to uninformed domestics has become conversations in which both sides make significant contributions." (p. 9)

There are three major dimensions to a professional development school in its fully developed form. In addition to the main focus on pupil learning, there is an emphasis on teacher development (preservice and inservice) and on school restructuring and reform. There is a great deal of diversity in how individual PDS's have prioritized these different aspects of their mission and in some sites there is not yet any attention to the practicum. Where the teacher education practicum has emerged in professional development schools however, it is often very different than practicums in which the

individual cooperating teacher's classroom is viewed as the practicum site. In a PDS, the entire school is involved in the induction of student teachers, not just individual cooperating teachers. (Abaal-Haqqal, 1991). Student teachers often spend more than one practicum in a school as they have done in the PDS's at my own university (Grant, Zeichner, Gillette, 1988; Gomez and Tabachnick, 1991), and frequently are assigned to a team of teachers rather than to an individual cooperating teacher. Supervision is usually performed by either school or university people who are based in the school for a substantial portion of their time rather than by occasional visits. It has been shown in several cases already, that in these schools the progress of practicum students becomes the business of the entire school (Pugach & Pasch, in press) and that cooperating teachers feel responsible for all the university students in their building (Kroll, et al., 1990).

It has also been shown that student teachers appreciate the opportunity to work with a variety of school staff instead of just one cooperating teacher, and that they begin to develop in these schools a view of teaching as collaborative work. For example, a student teacher in a Brookline Massachusetts PDS recently commented:

> I've really appreciated the fact that I never feel isolated. I always have someone to ask if I have a question. And it's very stimulating and very stimulating and very energizing to brainstorm ideas with another teacher-my co-teacher, or the person I'm sharing a science group with or anyone... I think I've worked with everyone in some way on the team. (Worth, 1990, p. 12).

In most practicum placements, as Cochran-Smith (1991, p. 91) points out, "there are few opportunities for either experienced teachers or student teachers to participate in thoughtful inquiry, to reflect on their daily decisions, or collaborate with others." (p.

285) In the PDS, there is a greater value placed on teacher learning and teacher development than is typically the case. Unlike most schools where the training of future teachers is a low or non existent priority, these schools assume the professional education of teachers as a primary function, and importantly, the intent is to give teacher educators the resources, support, and respect to do this important work that they now lack in many practicums. In professional development schools that have incorporated the practicum, cooperating teachers are often given faculty appointments at the university (Cornbleth, 1991) and play greater roles in planning and implementing the entire teacher education curriculum, while professors are spending more time hanging around schools and doing a variety of things in addition to practicum supervision, such as helping gather data for teacher research projects, working on curriculum development teams, or participating in school governance councils. Some universities are even beginning to revise their criteria for promotion and tenure to ensure that faculty are not punished for their work in these schools.[5]

In many of these efforts, more of the teacher education program has become school-based and seminars are offered which are attended by professors, teachers, administrators, and prospective teachers. All participants in these practicums of the future, ideally view themselves as learners, researchers, and reformers. The intent here is not to abandon what traditionally has been described as the "theoretical" component of programs as has been done in the alternate routes in the U.S. and the similar programs in the U.K. where the role of the university in preservice teacher education has become almost non-existent. The purpose is to ground these "theoretical" studies in the context of the practice of teaching and to engage both experienced and beginning teachers, as well as university faculty, in the reflective analysis of their work. It is also

not necessary in this new structural arrangement for the practicum to give up all of the innovations of the last decade related to the shift from an unstructured apprenticeship to an inquiry-oriented practicum. We can take advantages of all of these things-action research, journal writing, peer supervision and so on. The difference is that they are now situated within an institutional context that is supportive of teacher learning, in places where people are trying to make schools better places to work as well as schools that work better.[6]

There is a danger her of elitism: (1) that these emerging professional development schools can become so special that they cater only to the already advantaged (as was the case for many campus laboratory schools of the past), (2) that these schools are seen as models, so wonderful, that it becomes impossible to replicate them anywhere else. Importantly, in my view, many of the newly emerging PDS's, in Madison, in Milwaukee, in Oakland, in Houston, in Detroit, and elsewhere, are not moving in this direction. Many of these schools are beginning to emerge in the places where the challenges are the greatest, in the very schools that have been bypassed by so many of the educational reforms over the years. The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee and the Milwaukee Public Schools for example, have initiated 6 professional development schools in the last few years (Pugach & Pasch, in press;p Pasch & Pugach, 1990), that are all located in schools that they refer to as "unfinished schools," all serving mostly low income students of color, schools with records of low performance on achievement tests, and with as many of low performance on achievement tests, and with a many of the social and economic problems that I mentioned earlier. While these professional development schools and others like them are far from ideal models to be emulated at this point, they are very exciting places to learn to teach in.

Situating the teacher education practicum in schools like these involves immersing student teachers in environments that are undergoing the process of change from the ground up. The intent is according to Pasch and Pugach (1990) in Milwaukee, "that preservice students will see and value professional development and have the opportunity to participate in the process of changing schools as basic parts of their conceptions of teaching." (p. 118) Most importantly, from my point of view, locating the practicum in schools like these involves an affirmation of a commitment to the preparation of teachers to serve everybody's children. It involves a significant break from the moral vacuum that characterizes much of teacher education in North America, a preparation for teaching that has bypassed large number of immigrants and ethnic minority students, a teacher education enterprise that has in many ways abandoned the purposes of education in a democratic society and the struggle for social justice.

It is a very exciting time now for those of us who are involved in the education of prospective teachers in the practicum. It will be many years however, before the current transformation of the practicum is fully realized. What I have been discussing in this paper is not another one of those quick fix panaceas for some very complex problems that will go away in a few years after some group of reform entrepreneurs has exhausted their markets (Slavin, 1989), or a phenomenon that will be incorporated into existing patterns of clinical teacher education (Zeichner, 1986). I'm talking about something that is fundamentally altering the shape of both teaching and teacher education so that teachers can assume the rightful place as leaders of educational reform and teacher educators can assume their proper role in helping teacher to do so, for the benefit of everybody's children.

NOTES

1. See Zeichner (1992a) for documentation of my argument in relation to several teacher education programs in the U.S. that have used reflective practice as an organizing theme.

2. See Calderhead (1989), Grimmett, Mackinnon, Erickson, & Riecken (1990), Richardson (1990), and Zeichner (in press) for a more detailed discussion of the variety of meanings associated with the movement of reflective teacher education.

3. It is important to note as Lytle & Cochran-Smith (1990) point out, that knowledge about teaching produced by teachers through their research on their own practice, has largely been excluded from what has been defined as the "knowledge base of teaching."

4. See Liston & Zeichner (1991) chapter 7 for further discussion of this point.

5. This issue of developing institutional incentives for faculty to work in professional development schools is a major issue that has to be addressed by faculties in colleges and universities because of the long-term nature of this work. Goodlad's (1990) study of teacher education in the U.S. shows very clearly how difficult this task will be given the increasing number of teacher preparation institutions that have come to devalue work with schools.

6. It is also important, given my earlier comments about problematic uses of the concept of reflective practice in teacher education that the use of these instructional strategies be tied to clearly articulated conceptions of teaching, learning, schooling, and the social order. The use of these instructional strategies by themselves (eg., journals) does not signify anything in particular. Many teacher education program emphasizing different traditions of practice, use the same strategies. The important issues are the purposes toward which the strategies are directed and the specific quality of their use. It is the way in which different traditions of practice in teacher education are served by these instructional strategies which must be our focus, not the use of the strategies by itself (see Liston & Zeichner chapter 1 for further discussion of this issue).

References

Abaal-Haqqai, I. (1991). Professional development schools and educational reform: Concerns & concepts. Washington D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Acheson, K.A., & Gall, M.D. (1987). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers. Second Edition. New York: Longman.

Association for Supervision & Curriculum Development. (1988). Another set of eyes: Techniques for classroom observation. Alexandria, VA: ASCD.

Barton, L., Pollard, A., & Whitty, G. (in press). Change in teacher education: The case of England. In T. Popkewtiz (Ed.), Changing patterns of regulation & power in teacher education: Eight country study of reform practice in teacher education. Albany: SUNY Press.

Bastien, A., Fruchter, N., Gottell, M., Greer, C., & Haskins, K. (1985). Choosing equality: The case for democratic schooling. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Borys, A., Taylor, G., & LaRocque, L. (in press). The practicum: Its reconceptualization and connection to school renewal. International Journal of Educational Reform.

Bowers, C., & Flinders, D. (1991). Culturally responsive teaching and supervision. New York: Teachers College Press.

Bradley, A. (1991). While all agree on value of field experience, many say clinical training should be redesigned. Educational Week, March 13, pp. 17-24.

Britzman, D. (1991). Practice makes practice: A critical study of learning to teach. Albany: SUNY Press.

Buchmann, M., & Schwille, J. (1983). Education: The overcoming of experience. American Journal of Education, 92(1), 30-51.

Calderhead, J. (1989). Reflective teaching and teacher education. Teaching and Teacher Education, 5(1), 43-51.

Carnegie Forum on Education & the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century. Washington, D.C.: Author.

Chamberlin, C., & Vallance, J. (1991). Reflections on a collaborative school-based teacher education project. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 37(2), 141-156.

children's Defense Fund. (1991). The state of America's children. Washington, D.C.: Author

Clifford G.J., & Guthrie, J.W. (1988). Ed school. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Cochran-Smith, M (1991). Learning to teach against the grain. Harvard Educational Review, 61(3), 279-310.

Comer, J. (1988). Educating poor minority children. Scientific American, 259(5), 42-48.

Cornbleth, C. (1991). How do we sustain restructuring? An invitation for dialogue. the Holmes Group Forum, 5(2), 30-31.

Cruickshank, D. (1987). reflective teaching. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.

Cummins, J. (1986). Empowering minority students: A framework for inventions. Harvard Educational Review, 56(1), 18-36.

Elsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through repressive myths of critical pedagogy. Harvard Educational Review, 59(3), 297-324.

Erickson, G., & MacKinnon, A. (1991). Seeing classrooms in new ways: on becoming a science teacher. In d. Schon (Ed.), The reflective turn (pp. 15-37). New York: Teachers College Press.

Feiman-Nember, S., & Buchmann, M. (1985a). Pitfalls of experience in teacher education. Teachers College Record, 87, 49-65.

Feiman-Nemser, S., & Buchmann, M. (1987). When is student teaching teacher education. Teaching & teacher education, 3(4), 255-273.

Flowers, J., et al. (1948). School and community laboratory experiences in teacher education. Oneonta, New York: American Association of Teachers Colleges.

Freedman, S., Jackson, J., & Biles, K. (1983). Teaching: An imperiled profession. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching & policy (pp. 261-99). New York: Longman.

Gentile, J.R. (1988) Instructional improvement: Summary and analysis of Madeline Hunter's essential elements of instruction & supervision. Oxford, OH: National Staff Development Council.

Gomez, M., & Tabachnick, B.R. (1991). Preparing preservice teachers to teach diverse learners. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL.

Goodlad, J. (1990). Teachers for our nation's schools. San Francisco: Hossey Bass.

Goodman, J. (1986). Making early field experiences meaningful: A critical approach. Journal of Education for Teaching, 12(2), 109-125.

Gore, J. (1990). The struggle for pedagogies: Critical and feminist discourses as regimes of truth. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Grant, C., & Zeichner, K., & Gillette, M. (1988). Preparing teachers to teach diverse students in multicultural classrooms (Final Report). Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research & Improvement, U.S. Department of Education.

Grimmett, P., MacKinnon, A., Erickson, G., & Riecken, T. (1990). Reflective practice in teacher education. In R. Clift, W.R. Houston & M. Pugach (Eds.), Encouraging reflective practice in education (pp. 20-38). New York: Teachers College Press.

Guyton, E., & McIntyre, D.J. (1990). Student teaching and school experiences. In W.R. Houston (Ed.) Handbook of research in teacher education (pp. 514-534). New York: Macmillan.

Haberman, M (1987). Recruiting and selecting teachers for urban schools. New York: ERIC. Clearinghouse on Urban Education, Institute for Urban and Minority Education.

Holburn, P. & Olliver, S. (1988). Supervision of student teachers. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, New Orleans.

Holmes Group. (1990). Tomorrows schools. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Hopkins, D. (1985). Making perfect? - Form and structure in teaching practice. In D. Hopkins & K. Reid (Eds.), Rethinking teacher education, London: Croom Helm.

Kroll, L., Rutherford, M. Bowyer, J. & Hauben, M. (1990). The effect of a school-university partnership on the student teaching experience. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Lanier, J. & Little, J.W. (1986). Research on teacher education. In M. Wittrock (Eds.), Third handbook of research on teaching. (pp. 527-68). New York: Macmillan.

Levine, M. (Ed.). (1988). Professional practice schools: Building a model. American Federation of Teachers. (ERIC #ED313 344).

Liston, D. & Zeichner, K. (1991). Teacher education and the social conditions of schooling. New York: Routledge.

Lytle, S.L., & Cochran-Smith, M. (1990). Learning from teacher research. Teachers College Record, 92(1), 83-103.

Mahan, J. & Boyle, V. (1981). Multicultural teacher preparation. An attitudinal survey. Education Research Quarterly, 63, 97-104.

Massey, D. & Chamberlin, C. (1990). Perspective, evangelism and reflection in teacher education. In C. Day M. Popke & P. Denicolo (Eds.), Insight into teachers' thinking and practice (pp. 1333-154). London: Falmer.

McElliott, K. (1990). A teachers view of leadership in a PDS. Holmes Group Forum, 5(1), 9.

Meade, E. (1991). Reshaping the clinical phase of teacher preparation. Kappan, 72(9), 666-669.

Menter, I. (1989). Teaching practice stasis: Racism, sexism and school experience in initial teacher education. British Journal of Sociology in Education, 10(4), 459-473.

Miller, C. (1989). Peer supervision in a president teaching practicum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin-Madison.

Pasch, S. & Pugach, M. (1990). Collaborative planning for urban professional development schools. Contemporary Education, 61(3), 135-143.

Pugach, M. & Pasch, S. (in press). The challenge of creating urban professional development schools. In R. Yinger & K. Borman (Eds.), Restructuring education: Issues and strategies for communities, schools, and universities. Norwood, NJ: Ables.

Quality Education for Minorities Project. (1990). Education that works: An action plan for the education of minorities. Cambridge, MA: Author.

Richardson-Koehler, V. (1988). Barriers to the effective supervision of student teaching: A Field study. Journal of Teacher Education, 39(2), 28-34.

Samiroden, W.D. & Stewart, D. (1988). Dual placements of student teachers in an early education practicum. Edmonton: University of Alberta Faculty of Education Curriculum Praxis Occasional Paper No. 42.

Scheffler, I. (1968). University scholarship and the education of teachers. Teachers College Record, 70(1), 1-12.

Schon, D. (Ed.), (1991). The reflective turn. New York: Teachers College Press.

Schon, D. (1987). Educating the reflective practitioner. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Schon, D. (1983). The reflective practitioner. New York: Basic Books.

Slavin, R. (1989). PET and the pendulum: Faddism in education and how to stop it. Kappan, 70(10), 752-758.

Smith, W. (1980). The American teacher corps programme. In E. Hayle & J. Megarry (Eds.), Professional development of teachers. London: Nichols.

Smith, D. (1990). Intern satisfaction with cooperating teacher supervision. Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 36(2), 133-140.

Smith, B.). (1969). Teachers for the real world. Washington, DC: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

Stallings, J. & Kowalski, T. (1990). Research on professional development schools. In W.R. Houston (Ed.), Handbook of research on teacher education (pp. 251-266). New York: Macmillan.

Stallings, J., Bossung, J. & Martin, A. (1990). Houston Teaching Academy: Partnership in developing teachers. Teaching and Teacher Education, 6(4), 355-365.

Stone, E., & Morris, S. (1977). Teaching practicum: Problems and perspectives. London: Methuen.

Stones, E. (1984). Supervision in teacher education, London: Methuen.

Taylor, G. & Runte, R. 91991). Sociology, student-directed inquiry, and the first practicum. Curriculum and Teaching, 6(1), 53-58.

Turney, C., Eltiskik, Towler, J. & Wright, R. (1985). A new basis for teacher education: The practicum curriculum. Sydney: Sydney University Press.

Winter, R. (1989). Learning from experience: Principles and practice in action research. London: Falmer Press.

Worth, K. (1990). The Wheelock/Brookline collaborative: The internship program. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Zeichner, K. (1986). Social and ethical dimensions of reform in teacher education. In J. Hoffman & S. Edwards (Eds.), Reality and reform in clinical teacher education (pp. 87-108). New York: Random House.

Zeichner, K. (1990). Changing directions in the practicum: Looking ahead to the 1990s. Journal of Education for Teaching, 16(2), 105-132.

Zeichner, K. (1990b). Contradictions and tensions of the professionalization of teachers and the democratization of schools. Teachers College Record, 92(3), 363-379.

Zeichner, K. (1992). Educating teachers for cultural diversity. East Lansing: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.

Zeichner, K. (in press). Conceptions of reflective practice in teaching and teacher education. In G. Harvard & P. Hodkinsun (Eds.), Action and reflection in teacher education. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Zeichner, K. & Liston, D. (1987). Teaching student teachers to reflect. Harvard Educational Review, 57(1), 1-22.

Zimpher, N. (1989). The RATE Project: A profile of teacher education students. Journal of Teacher Education, 40(6), 27-30.

Zimpher, N. (1990). Creating professional development schools sites. Theory into Practice, 29(1), 42-49.

Zimpher, N., DeVoss, G. & Nott, D. (1980). A closer look at university student teacher supervision. Journal of Teacher Education, 31(4), 11-15.